UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,608	08/22/2003	Yoshio Sugimoto	2895-0138P	8586
	7590 02/22/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 3/A 220/0 07/7	NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1714		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DEL MEDITA VODE
	•		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/645,608	SUGIMOTO ET AL.	SUGIMOTO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Patrick D. Niland	1714			

•	Patrick D. Niland	1714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 January 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 Ci	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orige than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	iate extension fee ce action: or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>05 February 2007</u>. A be the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply AMENDMENTS 	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	11.37(e)), to avoid dis	missal of the
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below):	coausc
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	w);	, ,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an ϵ	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:	•	•	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu for the reasons stated in the final rejection.		n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		Λ
13.	C	Patrick D: Niland Primary Examiner	
		Δrt Init: 1714	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed claim drops the clarifying language of claim 7 regarding the amounts recited therein, particularly "in 100% by weight of the propylene polymer composition:". The new claims merely recite "(b) comprises" followed by percentages by weight. The recitation "wherein the total amount of the respective components is made 100% by weight". This does not clarify whether the amounts recited after "(b) comprises are to total within the range "18 to 25% by weight" or if the weights recited after "(b) comprises" are to total 100% of the weight of only (b) including the components encompassed by "comprises", as the claim grammar "(b) comprises" would suggest, or if any of the amounts after "(b) comprises" can be used as long as the total amounts equal 100% wt. of the composition. The last one would seem to contradict the claim 1 as it previously read since the prior claim required the ranges 50-70%, 18-25%, and 15-25% to total 100%. The issue of new matter is raised also in that some of these interpretations do not appear to be suppored by the specification as originally filed.